

DOCUMENTS AND MINUTES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY
AND
DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of May 9, 1988, published below, have been prepared for the immediate use of the members of the University Council and are included in its Documents and Proceedings. They are also included in the Documents and Minutes of the General Faculty for the information of the members.

H. Paul Kelley
H. Paul Kelley, Secretary
The General Faculty

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 9, 1988

The seventh regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1987-1988 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, May 9, 1988, at 2:15 p.m. President William H. Cunningham presided.

ATTENDANCE.

Present: Ricardo C. Ainslie, Lear L. Ashmore, Lee E. Baker, Mark E. Bernstein, Lowell J. Bethel, Harold W. Billings, Shirley F. Binder, Allen H. Bizzell, J. Harold Box, Robert E. Boyer, Oscar G. Brockett, Billye J. Brown, Ronald M. Brown, Cindy I. Carlson, Michael L. Cohen, Andrew M. Cooper, William H. Cunningham, James T. Doluisio, Arwin A. Dougal, John R. Durbin, David V. Edwards, Chris T. Flynn, Gerhard J. Fonken, Alan W. Friedman, R. LaVerne Gallman, J. David Gavenda, John M. Geringer, Austin M. Gleeson, Mario J. Gonzalez, Maureen M. Grasso, Alan Gribben, Mark F. Hamilton, Thomas M. Hatfield, Michael J. Hulbert, Robert C. Jeffrey, Judith A. Jellison, Sharon H. Justice, H. Paul Kelley, Robert D. King, Kenneth W. Kirk, William R. Koch, Jeanne M. Lagowski, J. Parker Lamb, James L. Larimer, Kirk D. Launius, William S. Livingston, John C. Loehlin, Leon E. Long, Madeline M. Maxwell, Priscilla P. Nelson, Shirley B. Perry, Brenda I. Preyer, John J. Ruskiewicz, Dolores Sands, Randi K. Shade, Edwin R. Sharpe, Jr., Max R. Sherman, Waneen W. Spirduso, William O. Sutherland, Jr., Michael J. Whellan, Walter Wilczynski, Martha S. Williams, Roxanne K. Williamson, J. Robert Wills, Robert E. Witt, Herbert H. Woodson, Ronald E. Wyllys, Mark G. Yudof.

Absent: John R. Barbaret, Lance Bertelsen, Julie H. Bichteler (excused), Elizabeth W. Fernea, Wallace T. Fowler (excused), G. Charles Franklin, William W. Gibson (excused), Joan A. Holladay (excused), Elaine K. Horwitz, Joseph E. Kruppa, Carol H. MacKay (excused), Ruth G. McRoy (excused), Henry A. Selby, Gideon A. Sjoberg, Raynard M. Sommerfeld (excused), Robert H. Wilson (excused).

Total members present: 68

Total members absent: 16

Following some parliamentary discussion, President Cunningham ruled that the motion to reconsider was not debatable, and the motion to reconsider was adopted by a show of hands.

Before the vote was taken on the reconsidered motion to table the proposal, Mr. Oakes, as a point of information, reported that David Stones (Data Base Coordinator, Office of the Registrar) had said "that there should not be a problem with this legislation at all in terms of the program handling it."

The motion to table was then adopted by a show of hands.

D. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE QUANTITY OF WORK RULE (D&P 11801-11802). (ADOPTED)

Melvin E. L. Oakes, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee, presented a motion that had been initiated by the student deans. The proposal, of the "housekeeping" variety, was to change the "quantity of work" rule in the General Information bulletin so that the rule would be the same for both upper-division and lower-division students. As the rule is currently worded, a lower-division student is permitted to register for 18 hours of credit but an upper-division student who has performed in the previous semester with the same number of grade points is not permitted to do so. The motion was made and seconded. Without further discussion, the motion was adopted by a voice vote.

E. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 11715-11758). (REFERRED TO EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE)

Allen H. Bizzell (Accounting), reported for Wallace T. Fowler (Aerospace Engineering/Engineering Mechanics), Chair of the ad hoc Committee to Review the Basic Education Requirements, who could not be present. "On March 30, 1987, the President appointed a committee to conduct a brief assessment of the impact of the implementation of basic education requirements and requested that the committee report to this body. I am here ... today to do that on behalf of the committee. Let me do [so] by summarizing three things for you -- ... the procedures we used in carrying out our brief assessment, ... the findings, and [the] general recommendations which we will make to the President. The material containing our report and recommendations ... can be found in D&P 11715-11758.

"To conduct this brief assessment we interviewed deans [or their] representatives from all the schools and colleges, we submitted a written survey to all department chairmen, we made special requests of the Office of Institutional Studies for information, we solicited letters and information from interested faculty, and we solicited information from the Center for Teaching Effectiveness. After the initial data-gathering process, the committee broke into four subcommittees, treating, respectively, Mathematics [and] Natural Sciences, Fine Arts/Humanities and

Social Sciences, Foreign Languages, and English and the Substantial Writing Component. Working separately and together those subcommittees reached the following conclusions:

"First, we found widespread support for basic education requirements throughout the campus. There seemed to be a positive [effect] not only on undergraduates at the University, but on the high schools throughout the state in their academic preparation of students for the University.

"Second, we found [that,] despite the imposition of the general education requirements on certain departments and certain courses within departments, there were ... few identifiable new resources and ... little reallocation of existing resources to meet the shift in demands. One of those demands was a considerable increase in the number of semester credit hours generated in certain departments.

"Third, the strained resources affected the departments impacted rather severely. This impact was compounded by the increase in University enrollment since 1982. While virtually all of the departments and courses which service basic education requirements [were affected adversely, the] substantial writing courses were [the] most severely impacted. The ... substantial writing requirement discourages many faculty from offering courses because of the demand for those courses; in fact, some courses which previously had met the substantial writing component requirement had been changed so that they would not meet that requirement, thereby avoiding the demand of the basic education requirements. We also found in those courses and others that the department had to divert financial resources from its tenure faculty line into lecture and assistant instructor appointments to provide the substantial writing component.

"Those general findings are summarized on [D&P] 11717-11718. The more specific findings with respect to each of the four subcommittees can be found on [D&P] 11729 and following. I will not refer to those, I leave that for your discretion; however, I would like to summarize the general recommendations which are found on [D&P] 11719. These are the recommendations that this committee will present to the President....

"[First,] the Committee recommends that the current Basic Education Requirements be retained [and] that the courses taught to meet the requirements be of high quality.

"Second, the Committee recommends that there be conscientious efforts [made] to match the enrollment demands of the Basic Education Requirements with the resources needed to meet those demands. This could be achieved by either providing additional resources to the departments and courses impacted by the Basic Education Requirements or by reducing the enrollment of the components that place a demand on those requirements.

"Third, the Committee recommends that the University consider requiring [that] at least half of the substantial writing component credit be earned in the student's major department, or perhaps in the college in which the student is enrolled.

"Finally, based on the uncertainties we still feel after this brief assessment, we recommend that the administration consider an ongoing study tracking the enrollments, class sizes, and related matters with respect to the Basic Education Requirements.

"I will be happy to answer questions...."

Michael J. Whellan (Cabinet of College Councils) asked, "Is every department on campus equipped to handle all those writing component courses?" Mr. Bizzell replied, "Some have claimed that they are not."

Alan W. Friedman (English) requested and received privileges of the floor for James L. Kinneavy (English). Mr. Kinneavy said: "I read with considerable interest the report on the English and substantial writing courses. I have a question or two that I hope [can be answered]. Since the first recommendation on [D&P] 11719 is to strongly support the current Basic Education Requirements, am I to read that as saying you are still currently supporting the 15 [semester] hours of writing requirements that the Vick Committee recommended?" Mr. Bizzell responded "No, we are supporting the Basic Education Requirement as implemented."

Mr. Kinneavy then said: "The first implementation was by the University Council, which changed it to English 306, English 316K, and English 346K, and six hours in substantial writing courses; [is that] right?" Mr. Bizzell agreed that was correct.

Mr. Kinneavy continued: "Then when the Lecturers were fired, or not rehired, and [English] 346K was suspended, did that not result in most of the colleges changing catalogs to downgrade the number of [semester hours of] English courses from nine to six?" Again, Mr. Bizzell concurred.

Mr. Kinneavy concluded: "Does that, then, ... mean that we are not talking about a [12-semester-hour] writing requirement?" Mr. Bizzell said: "We are talking about a 12-hour writing requirement...."

Dean Robert C. Jeffrey (Communication) said that he thought the committee should be commended "for an outstanding piece of work. It is apparently well researched [and] it certainly [is] well stated. After ... commending the committee and receiving the report, I MOVE that it be referred to the Educational Policy Committee for any specific recommendations that they might want to make for changing the Basic Education Requirements." The motion was seconded.

John R. Durbin (Mathematics), saying that he thought the recommendations were "a bit vague," asked if the Council would get to talk about the substantial writing component requirement. "I am not convinced that this whole business about the substantial writing component is working right now. I do not think the Council should ignore that forever, and I am willing to wait until the Educational Policy Committee comes back with it if we are certain that they will come back with it...." Dean Jeffrey said that such was his intent.

The motion to refer the recommendations to the Educational Policy Committee was then APPROVED by a voice vote.

IX. NEW BUSINESS.

- A. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE HANDBOOK OF OPERATING PROCEDURES FROM THE FACULTY SENATE (D&P 11713). (FIRST REVISION AMENDED AND DEFEATED; SECOND REVISION AMENDED AND APPROVED)

Alan W. Friedman (English), Chair of the Faculty Senate, presented a proposal to make two revisions to the U.T. Austin Handbook of Operating Procedures. "Both of these [revisions] originated in the Council of Former Faculty Senate Chairs, a body which is chaired by John Durbin.... I believe it was Charles Alan Wright who was charged to look into both of these questions and came up with the specific wording...."

The first revision would make the Chair of the Faculty Senate an ex officio member of all the standing committees of the General Faculty. Mr. Friedman said: "I believe the thinking with regard to the first one, as Charles Alan Wright presented it at the meeting of the former Senate Chairs, was ... two things primarily. [The first] is that the Chair of the Faculty Senate is like the President of the University, the only other person who is authorized to call meetings of the General Faculty; therefore there is some parallel in the positions already. The second is [that] because of the difficulties of communicating between the standing committees and the Faculty Senate, it would be very useful for someone on the Faculty Senate, preferably the Chair, to be on the mailing list for all correspondence concerning the standing committees. There is no presumption here that the Chair of the Senate would be attending all of [the committee] meetings anymore than there is a presumption that the President attends all of these meetings...." On behalf of the Faculty Senate, Mr. Friedman then MOVED that the first revision be approved, and the motion was seconded.

John R. Durbin (Mathematics) noted that "it might not be quite accurate to say these originated with [the Council of Former Faculty Senate Chairs]. We were asked to study the whole issue of standing committees, and this is what we came up with."

Dean Thomas M. Hatfield (Continuing Education) asked what standing committees the proposal referred to -- committees of the Faculty Senate,